

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-54 were pending in the application and stand rejected. Claims 55-60 have been added and claim 1 has been amended, without acquiescence in the cited basis for rejection or prejudice to pursue the original claims in a related application. No new matter has been added.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being a software module or software per se. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Amended claim 1 recite the system comprises one or more servers. Thus, the federated system is clearly not software per se or merely a software module. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 1-3, 9-49 and 52-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,711,585 B1 issued to Copperman et al. (hereinafter Copperman). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 1 explicitly recites "the taxonomy view of the at least one node allows at least one of the data source defined on the at least one node to be integrated into a standardized schema" (emphasis added). Copperman does not disclose at least this feature.

Copperman is directed to system and method for implementing a knowledge management system. Copperman discloses a knowledge map 10 for organizing various dimension of information. As shown in FIG. 1, knowledge map 10 comprises knowledge containers 20, taxonomies 30 and taxonomy tags 40. Knowledge containers 20 are individual instances of information that may be associated with one or more taxonomies 30 through the use of one or more taxonomy tags 40. Moreover, Copperman discloses all knowledge containers tagged to a particular node are in the same index. A mapping from nodes to indexes is maintained for use at retrieval time. An index covers a concept node if the knowledge containers tagged to the node are in the index. However, Copperman is silent with respect to integrating data sources as

claimed. Thus, Copperman does not disclose at least the limitation “the taxonomy view of the at least one node allows at least one of the data source defined on the at least one node to be integrated into a standardized schema” (emphasis added).

Because Copperman fail to disclose all the limitations of the claim 1 and its dependent claims, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 4 and 7-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Copperman in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0087516 A1 to Cras et al. (hereinafter Cras). Claims 5-6 and 50-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Copperman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,795,868 B1 issued to Dingman et al. (hereinafter Dingman). Applicants respectfully traverse.

As stated above Copperman does not teach or suggest “the taxonomy view of the at least one node allows at least one of the data source defined on the at least one node to be integrated into a standardized schema” (emphasis added). According to the Office Action, Cras teaches interchanging data from nodes with the level and user profile, updating data source, content of sources and notifying to the user. Moreover, the Office action states that Dingman teaches data synchronization and replication and variety of API. The Office action fail to show Cras or Dingman teach or suggest “the taxonomy view of the at least one node allows at least one of the data source defined on the at least one node to be integrated into a standardized schema” (emphasis added). Thus, Copperman, Cras and Dingman et al., singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least the limitation “the taxonomy view of the at least one node allows at least one of the data source defined on the at least one node to be integrated into a standardized schema” (emphasis added).

Because the cited references fail to teach or suggest the claims as a whole, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing, all claims are believed allowable, and an allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

To the extent that any arguments and disclaimers were presented to distinguish prior art, or for other reasons substantially related to patentability, during the prosecution of any and all parent and related application(s)/patent(s), Applicant(s) hereby explicitly retracts and rescinds any and all such arguments and disclaimers, and respectfully requests that the Examiner re-visit the prior art that such arguments and disclaimers were made to avoid.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge Vista IP Law Group LLP Account No. 50-1105 for any fees required that are not covered, in whole or in part, and to credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account No. 50-1105.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 18, 2008

**Vista IP Law Group LLP**  
1885 Lundy Avenue,  
Suite 108  
San Jose, CA 95131  
Telephone: (408) 321-8663

By: /Jasper Kwoh/  
Jasper Kwoh  
Registration No. 54,921  
for  
Peter C. Mei  
Registration No. 39,768